## SHORTER NOTES

**Allium platyphyllum** sp. nov.—Plant 15 cm. high or more; bulb subglobose, the outer coat somewhat reticulate; leaves 2 or 4, flat, about 20 cm. long, 1–1.3 cm. wide, falcate; scapes solitary or in twos, 10–12 cm. long, compressed, winged; bracts 2, ovate, membranous; flowers numerous, rose-purple, borne on slightly winged pedicels about 15 mm. long; perianth segments oblong-ovate, acuminate, 10 mm. long or less; filaments included, membranous, dilated at the base; fruit not seen.

Type in the U. S. National Herbarium (Frederick V. Coville, no. 2362) collected on steep scab-land in the Valley of Peavine Creek on the trail from Chico to Billy Meadows, Wallowa National Forest, Oregon, at an elevation of about 1,200 meters.

This species is readily recognized by its broad, falcate leaves, its compressed winged scapes, the latter appearing singly or in

pairs. It is closely related to *Allium anceps** and *A. falcifolium*. The perianth segments of the former are linear-lanceolate, spreading and in the proposed oblong-ovate, acuminate, erect.

*Allium falcifolium* has the narrow perianth segments of *A. anceps* and the rather thin curved leaves of the proposed species. *Allium anceps* is also distinguished by its exserted stamens and thick leaves. The width of the leaves of *A. platyphyllum*, however, is nearly double that of *A. falcifolium*.

IVAR TIDESTROM.

STENOPHYLLUS FLORIDANUS IN SOUTH CAROLINA.—In 1894 Mr. G. V. Nash collected in "high pine land" in Lake County, Florida, a small annual sedge which was described the following year in his account of the season's work as *Stenophyllus floridanus* Britton.† For the next few years nothing else was known about it, and it was probably regarded as one of numerous species endemic to the lake region of Florida. But in the years 1900–1908 I found it in many counties in the coastal plain of Georgia,‡ always in unnatural habitats, such as cultivated fields and sandy roadsides, and in 1909–1914 I found it occurring similarly in Middle Florida.§ On Aug. 22, 1913, while waiting for a connecting train at Branchville, Orangeburg County, South Carolina, I found the same plant in sandy cotton fields right in the town; and a little later in the day I saw considerable quantities of it from the train, in fields in Dorchester County.

Although this species was treated as a native when first described, it is known only in habitats modified by civilization, and therefore could hardly have existed in the United States in prehistoric times. The fact that it was not recognized by botanists before 1894, although it is amply distinct from other southeastern species of the genus, and is now known in thirty or forty counties, would seem to indicate that it is a comparatively recent introduction, probably from the tropics. (It is very similar to, if not identical with, *Isolepis barbata* (Rottb.) R. Br.,

* Curtis Bot. Mag. III; 32: t. 6227. 1876.

† Bull. Torrey Club 22: 161. 1895.

‡ See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 17: 283. 1906.

§ See Ann. Rep. Fla. Geol. Surv. 6: 263, 286, 293. 1914.

a species which seems to be common in India and some other parts of Asia.)

ROLAND M. HARPER.

## REVIEWS

### Young's Catalogue d'Arbres Arbustes et Plantes Herbacees d'Amerique*

According to Mr. Rhoads this is the "earliest published book written by an American botanist and devoted exclusively to American botany, horticulture and floriculture," and it "has been either purposely ignored or entirely overlooked by scientists, historians and bibliographers." The former statement is more true than significant as Cadwallader Colden (1749–1751) and Peter Kalm (1753–1761), both botanists of note, had previously drawn attention to our flora, while horticulture and floriculture had received a good deal of printed notice as early as 1670 in the writings of Daniel Denton of Hempstead, L. I., and later in the catalogs of Prince's nursery, a collection so valuable that the invading British issued a special order, during their occupation of New York, that the "nurseries of Mr. Prince of Flushing are not to be destroyed" (order of J. Robinson, English officer at New York, 16 June, 1780). That the book which Mr. Rhoads has edited is of unquestioned interest no one can deny, but that it adds anything to our existing knowledge of the botany or horticulture of the latter part of the eighteenth century, the citations above would seem to disprove.

The catalog is most interesting as showing the ideas of our flora as understood at that time. Many common species, apparently under Linnaean names, are scattered through it, but without hazarding a definite prophecy it looks also as though those gifted with a talent for "nailing" earliest publication of names for American species, have been furnished with some highly charged ammunition. The editor evidently tries to wash his

* William Young, Jr. (of Philadelphia), "Botaniste de Pensylvanie," and his long-forgotten book, being a facsimile reprint of his "Catalogue d'Arbres Arbustes et Plantes Herbacees d'Amerique." Published in Paris in 1783. With prefatory account of the author and critical notes by the editor, Samuel N. Rhoads. Pp. i–ix + 1–55. Large paper, 4to, $4.00. Small paper, 8vo, $2.75. Privately printed. Philadelphia, 1916.